

1 DELEGATE WILLONER: Well, as I understand your
2 answer, is it true this is to have no effect?

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Vecera.

4 DELEGATE VECERA: As I understand it, Delegate
5 Willoner, this amendment, prior, had an oath to go
6 with the amendment that was stricken in the recent case of
7 the University of Maryland professor.

8 Let me read you a sentence. Maybe it will clear
9 up the matter of why we want it in.

10 "In the recent case of Whitehill v. Elkins, 36
11 Law Week 4006, November 6, 1967, the Supreme Court of
12 the United States held that the sworn statement
13 required by the State of the plaintiff as a condition
14 precedent to his taking a teaching job at the University
15 of Maryland was unconstitutional under the United States
16 Constitution because it impinged upon freedoms guaranteed
17 by the first amendment. The Supreme Court did not indicate
18 that any such required statement would be unconstitutional
19 but found that the statement required of Whitehill was bad
20 because it was so vague that it did not permit a man of com-
21 mon intelligence to know specifically what was encompassed